



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,889	06/25/2003	Hiroki Kobayashi	R2184.0239/P239	2305
24998	7590	11/27/2006	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1825 EYE STREET NW Washington, DC 20006-5403			NEWAY, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/602,889

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI, HIROKI

Examiner

Samuel G. Neway

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment filed 09/13/2006.
2. Claims 1 – 9 are pending and are considered below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for scenarios (16) including parameters specific to the computer, does not reasonably provide enablement for templates (11) including parameters specific to the computer (see FIG. 3, and related text). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The limitation “the template including parameters specific to the computer” is not taught in Applicant’s specification. Actually it is the scenario that contains parameters specific to the computer, the template, as clearly stated in Applicant’s summary, “is to describe items common to the plurality of computers. That is, the network administrator produces and provides only the template and the database, and the computers automatically produce the scenario specific to each of the computers...”. The Examiner

will assume that it is the scenarios that contain parameters specific to the computer as disclosed in Applicant's specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Machida (US PGPub 2002/0083131).

Claim 1: Machida discloses a software-installing method for installing software in a computer so as to use one of a plurality of printing devices connected the computer through a network (see [0004]), the method comprising the steps of:

acquiring a template of a scenario which is a file describing procedures for installing the software ("acquires driver setup information", [0051], see also FIG. 2, item s202);

acquiring data corresponding to the parameters contained in the template with respect to said computer ("property information list is transmitted to a pc", [0064] –

[0066], see also FIG. 2, steps s204 - s206) by searching an installation database ("property information may be stored in a registry", [0053])

and producing the scenario which is specific to said computer by incorporating the acquired data into the parameters of said template ("update the driver in accordance with the acquired property information ", [0073], see FIG. 2, step s208 and FIG. 7, step s607).

Claim 2: Machida discloses the software-installing method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a step of inputting the produced scenario to an installation program (see [0073], [0096]-[0097]).

Claim 3: Machida discloses the software-installing method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a step of acquiring the data corresponding to the parameters from the installation database located outside said computer ("managed in a centralized fashion by the server device") (see [0074]).

Claim 4: Machida discloses the software-installing method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a step of acquiring data regarding print setting information as data for said parameters from said installation database (see [0096]).

Claim 5: Machida discloses a software-installing method for installing software in a computer so as to use one of a plurality of printing devices connected the computer through a network ([004]), the method comprising the steps of:

producing a template of a scenario which describes procedures for installing the software (see [0068] and figure 7, [0095] and figure 23);

and producing the scenario, which is specific to said computer, based on the produced template (see [0073], [0096]-[0097]).

Claim 6: Machida discloses a processor readable medium storing program code means for causing a computer to install therein software to use one of a plurality of printing devices connected the computer through a network ([004]), the medium comprising:

program code means for acquiring a template of a scenario which is a file describing procedures for installing the software ("acquires driver setup information", [0051], see also FIG. 2, item s202);

program code means for acquiring data corresponding to the parameters contained in the template with respect to said computer ("property information list is transmitted to a pc", [0066], see also FIG. 2, item s206) by searching an installation database ("property information may be stored in a registry", [0053])

and program code means for producing the scenario which is specific to said computer by incorporating the acquired data into the parameters of said template ("update the driver in accordance with the acquired property information ", [0073]).

Claim 7: Machida discloses the processor readable medium as claimed in claim 6, further comprising program code means for inputting the produced scenario to an installation program (see [0073], [0096]-[0097]).

Claim 8: Machida discloses the processor readable medium as claimed in claim 6, further comprising program code means for acquiring the data corresponding to the

Art Unit: 2192

parameters from the installation-database located outside said computer ("managed in a centralized fashion by the server device") (see [0074]).

Claim 9: Machida discloses the processor readable medium as claimed in claim 6, further comprising program code means for acquiring data regarding print setting information as data for said parameters from said installation database (see [0096]).

***Response to Amendment***

7. The objections made to the specification and Claims 1, 5, and 6 in the first Office Action have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's corrections.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the "template of a scenario" is not an application or program as in Machida (Re Remark section on page 6, last paragraph). However, examiner disagrees with how Applicant characterized Machida's teachings. What Applicant relied upon, Machida's driver installation module 371 (FIG. 23), is not what Examiner relied upon. Rather, what Examiner has been pointing out is the set-up driver info structure (template) and property info (scenario) as applied herein above.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 8:00AM - 5:00 PM EST.



Art Unit: 2192

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN

SN



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER